

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/542,076	07/13/2005	Kai Eck	DE030024US1	8935	
24737 PHILIPS INT	7590 04/14/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 300	1	ZEILBERGER, DANIEL			
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/14/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/542,076		ECK, KAI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL ZEILBERGER	2624	

	DANIEL ZEILBERGER	2624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1. So The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 T CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
	a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) Mean The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. It no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		136(a) and the appropriat	a extension fee			
have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS	tnin the time period set forth in 37	CFR 41.37(a).				
⊠ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a company of the property		ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1			DTOL OOA			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,9,12,18 and 21-32.						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.9.12.18 and 21-52. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4.133(d)(1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. □ Other:						
/Vikkram Bali/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624	/Daniel Zeilberger/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624	ı				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claim 1 would require further consideration as to whether the previously citled art would read on the claim as currently written, and additional search. Specifically, the claim limitation of providing a pattern of marking elements "Indicative of the position of the patient" appears to substantially change the scope of the claim. In addition, the claim limitation of the marking elements are conceased in noise such that the pattern as a whole is detectable from a correlation between the diagnostic image and a filter image of the pattern and such that each element is not individually detectable by a computer system and by a human viewer of the diagnostic image "would also require further consideration. Claim 9 also contains an amendment that vould require further consideration, namely "the absorption of the x-rays being sufficiently low that the pattern is detectable by correlation of the x-ray image reconstructed from the output of the detector," as it defers in structure and scope from other previous smillar limitations. The above amendments to claims 1 and 9 would also change the scope of any dependent claims and thus would necessitate further consideration of any corresponding dependent claims.